CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL of the PACIFIC LIBRARY

The Modern Churchman.

No. 2. MAY, 1916. Vol. VI.

SIGNS OF THE TIMES.

"The Free Churches at the Cross Roads."

English Nonconformity is becoming restless and dissatisfied. This is a good sign. The Rev. J. H. Shakespeare's Presidential address at the Bradford Free Church Council, in which he urged the establishment of a "United Free Church of England," to be realised by the federation of all the Nonconformist bodies represented at the Free Church Council, is a movement in the right direction, and one with which Anglicans of every school will have strong sympathy. The realisation of the scheme is one of immense difficulty, but financial pressure, which will become more serious as the war continues, and the obvious folly of needless overlapping, will do much to assist the movement among the Nonconformist laity.

In the case of the younger Nonconformist clergy, modern theological education is doing a great deal to obliterate the old doctrinal and ecclesiastical land-marks. Denominational differences that once seemed necessary to salvation are now regarded as non-essentials. With the growth of this temper among the younger ministers, almost anything in the way of unity becomes possible within the next few years.

Yet to regard economy and education as the two main factors in the movement is not perhaps altogether just. There is on the part of the Nonconformist leaders a great longing for unity because it is in harmony with the Spirit of Christ. May we urge that they need to consider very carefully the bases for that unity. The document which some of them recently signed in common with the Bishop of Oxford might, if generally adopted, lead to a unity which would succeed in uniting conservative Christians, but would end by excluding progressive

ones. As the Rev. J. M. Lloyd Thomas, the editor of the *Liberal Catholic*, pointed out in the *Christian Commonwealth* of April 5th:—

> "This is no mere matter for office adjustments between a number of dissenting sects. It is a Christian crisis that concerns the religious life and destiny of England. We are still haunted by the ghosts of those Puritans who knew well that they did not want Popery, or Laud's tyranny, or the degrading frivolities of the ungodly, but did not know what to put in their place, so that when they attempted a constructive national programme they broke up into secessions and feuds and anarchies which made the Restoration a welcome relief. Let us beware of consolidating again the wrong elements and of separating Lord Falkland from John Hampden. The first condition of success is a thoroughly massive and detailed survey of the field and a resolute refusal to tinker with the problem by instalments. If it is to be handled at all it must be handled fearlessly and firmly as a complete National Reformation. To this end we must not be too proud to call in as assessors Liberal Catholics and Broad Anglicans and some Educationalists who are not necessarily associated with any denomination."

This we regard as the utterance of a far-seeing ecclesiastical statesman, but we wonder how much support it will get in Free Church circles.

"A New Pentecost."

In the *C.M.S. Gazette* for May the Bishop of Barrow-in-Furness deals with the theme of "Adaptability," and observes in the English Church what has been noted in the English commercial world, a slowness and unwillingness to adapt old methods to new needs. He sees this amongst our English Missionaries in India. Here we think he does not do justice to the courageous efforts being made especially by S.P.G Missionaries to co-operate with the Indian religious spirit, and to present the Christian religion in a form which appeals to it. *The East and the West*, the organ of the S.P.G., has of late furnished most encouraging reading for liberally minded Churchmen. We refer particularly to articles by Miss Eleanor C. Gregory, the Revs. P. B. Emmet and G. C. Binyon. However, perhaps the Bishop is really reproving the people in England who strive to control the policy of the missionary societies in the interests of the *mort main*.

That stay-at-home conservatives or retired missionaries should prevent those on active service from solving their own problems on their own lines will not seem a wise or good course to adopt, and we have no doubt that the Bishop feels that also, but perhaps it is not quite easy for him to say it.

When the Bishop turns to the Church at home he tells us that:—

> "We are painfully realizing that with all the supposed rally to religion as a result of the war, the nation has not re-embraced the national Church. There is certainly a more vivid realization of what Christ and the Cross mean, but not a growing conviction that the Church is the living expression of those mysteries. It is satisfactory to feel how thoroughly we can justify our services and our beliefs, and how admirably they find expression, but that is not enough. For some reason many of our fellow-citizens do not feel that our Christ is their Christ. He does not speak their language, or think their thoughts, or realize their aspirations. He is noble but cold, definite but distant. They seem to feel that we have made Christ in our own image."

Perhaps the fact that we feel we are so well able to "justify our services and our beliefs" accounts for our declining influence.

A growing spirit of humility, sympathy, and faith, the desired outcome of the National Mission, the Bishop believes to be the true remedy; yet he seems to doubt whether the Church will really seek whole-heartedly this newness of life.

> "We are tempted, so to speak, to invest part of our capital in the new venture, and to keep enough in the old securities to fall back upon in case of failure. To repent and yet not to repent, to hope and yet not to hope. We confess that the possibilities of our present resources at home and abroad seem about exhausted, and yet we hesitate to make the plunge. We say nothing but a new Pentecost can meet the case. That is exactly what we are being called on to prepare for, pray for, and to expect; nothing more, nothing less."

"Small Latin and less Greek."

We clip the following from the *Canadian Churchman:*

> 'The Archdeacon of Stowe, at the Sheffield Diocesan Conference, revealed a Bishop's secret when he said that, after the war, Bishops are going to waive Greek, and to demand character instead from ordination candidates. The question of Latin is more difficult, as the Preface to the Ordinal declares that candidates must be found 'learned in the Latin Tongue'; but this may, too, have to be waived, for even in the past the learning in the Latin tongue has not always been very evident. The Archdeacon states that after the Crimean War 1,250 men came back and took Holy Orders. In the present war a great many more men would find their vocation and desire to enter the ministry. It is good to know that the Bishops are

> carefully reviewing the situation, for the Church will need the best men to take the lead during the trying years after the war. Now we have a great opportunity. The country will never be content with a drifting religion. It must be real if it is to be effective. Several who have closely observed the tendency of thought say that our religion will become much simpler and more fundamental, and that institutional Christianity will have a bad time before it in the presence of strong personal convictions brought to birth in the great crucible of war. What we need is a clear guide as to the requirements of our Bishops. It is not too soon to give it, as a number of wounded men are already thinking of the ministry, and prisoners interned are quietly studying to prepare for entrance in readiness for the time when peace is declared.' "

We urged some months ago in the *Modern Churchman* that Greek should be made an optional subject, and that Latin should be frankly discarded in the Deacons' examination. However, we do not believe in a negative policy. What do the Bishops propose to substitute? Character seems a little vague and not altogether an examination subject. As well might conversion be substituted for Church History, and clear articulation for the XXXIX Articles. That good knight Sir Roger de Coverley would have applauded such a proposal. He had no desire to be insulted with Latin and Greek at his table by his own clergyman. What he desired for that functionary was "plain sense" rather than "much learning," "a good aspect, a clear voice, and sociable temper, and if possible a man that understood a little of backgammon." What we would propose, however, is that those who do not offer Greek and Latin should offer in their stead English Literature from Chaucer to Tennyson. Such a course would give the average ordinand much more literary culture than he gets from "the classics," and would be of immense help in his ministerial work. Many of our poets have also been our prophets.

How any honest man who feels bound by the letter of the prescription "learned in the Latin Tongue," can either present or ordain nine out of every ten ordinands is an enigma. At present in many dioceses a feeble but ineffective effort is made to comply with the letter of the Preface to the Ordinal, but not sufficient attention is given to its spirit.

Bishop Barry rightly interpreted "learned in the Latin Tongue" as "representing general education." The Preface was written in 1552, and at that date no Englishman could be well educated who could not read, and perhaps we ought to add speak, Latin fluently. Roger Ascham, a contemporary of the Preface, makes, if we recollect rightly, some sort of apology for writing his *Schoolmaster* "in the English tongue for Englishmen." Simple religious manuals were written in the vulgar tongue for the unlearned, but books of science and philosophy and general culture were composed in Latin. The best substitute to-day for being "learned in the Latin Tongue" would be to possess a sound knowledge of our great English writers, and some appreciation of the treasures they have given to the English race. At any rate let us have done with shams and make-believe in this matter, and may we not have to wait ten years for the reform.

"Ordinary Anglicanism."

The following letter by the Vicar of West Malvern, published recently in the *Guardian*, draws attention to an aspect of Church life which is apt to be over-looked by the readers of our Church newspapers.

"Sir,—Your columns have for many weeks been full of lamentations over the failure of 'ordinary Anglicanism'; your correspondents uplift the battle cry of 'Catholic Revolt.'

"I am perplexed: to me it seems that in this critical moment of the nation's life the failure—conspicuous, complete, and overwhelming—has been with those who have claimed for themselves the glorious name of 'Catholic.' They have done little or nothing.

"Meanwhile it is 'ordinary' Anglicanism which has united with 'ordinary' Nonconformity to accomplish the magnificent and successful work of the Y.M.C.A.: it is 'ordinary' Anglicanism which inspires the Church Army; and the whole nation has learnt to acknowledge with gratitude and admiration the services which these two organiztions have been conspicuous in rendering to the young men of England abroad and at home.

"And now again, when care for the young women who are working for the nation has become the urgent need of the moment, it is the Y.W.C.A. that steps forward to offer its help; and the Y.W.C.A. finds its strength and its support not among 'Catholics,' but among 'ordinary' Churchpeople.

"Is it an exaggeration to say that 'ordinary' Churchpeople—with their friends the 'ordinary' Nonconformists—have done everything for the nation's young men and young women, but that 'Catholics' have done almost nothing? English 'Catholicism' has in this testing time of war proved itself an ineffective failure, if not quite a spent force. It has done nothing except inquire whether the Church of England is worth preserving. Meanwhile, the Church of Christ, forgetting its quarrels, has been working miracles before our eyes: and in this glorious and wonderful work 'Catholicism' has had no share."

Comparisons are odious, but in the face of specious and never-ceasing partisan-advertisement, it becomes a duty to draw attention to another aspect of affairs.

Kikuyu and the War.

The *Church Gazette* for April publishes an article by Mr. A. F. Walker, a member of the Churchmen's Union. The article deals with Kikuyu and the War. The writer holds that the War ought to teach English Churchmen three lessons and that these three lessons were the ones which Kikuyu tried to realise in a practical form.

"I think it is true to say: First, that the war has not only taught us afresh the value of unity, but has shown us that where there is an adequate realisation of the greatness of the effort required a corresponding degree of unity is produced. Secondly, that the war has brought us into direct contact with reality, both in life and religion. And thirdly, that the war has shown us that the co-operation of Allies must be real, and close, and cordial, if victory is to be won. Now by far the greatest and most inspiring task which has been given to any body of men was that which was bequeathed by Christ to His disciples at His Ascension —the winning of the kingdoms of this world for the kingdom of our Lord. We should, therefore, expect to find the most complete unity among those entrusted with this great work. But we find that, in point of fact, it is not unity but disunion which is in proportion to the greatness of the task. Here indeed we have to contemplate a deplorable state of things. Surely, in all history, there has been no more sad and tragic spectacle than that presented by the growth among Christians of strife and divisions which are the very negation of the first principles of their Lord and the Gospel which He preached. . . . To what conclusion, then, are we led? Is it not that if the Churches are to minister to the newly awakened religious needs of thousands of our fellow countrymen to whom real Christianity will be everything, but ecclesiasticism nothing, and if they are to engage, effectively, in the great spiritual war against the mighty forces of evil both in the mission field and in our own land, they must, as Churches, get back to Christ, and resolutely refuse to allow anything

which, in the light of what we know of His mind, would not stand as an essential of Christian Churchmanship, to defeat His Divine purpose of unity? As the Churches come more and more into line with that purpose they will, I believe, become increasingly conscious of spiritual power."

Ordinands and Military Service.

Now that military service is being made compulsory for all between the ages of 18 and 41, except they are specially exempted, we may look for the closing of our remaining theological colleges. This seeming disaster may prove a blessing in disguise, if it be used as a favourable opportunity for re-casting their course of studies and the whole system of intellectual training for Holy Orders.

It is a matter of gratification that at last the bishops have definitely declared that after Trinity Sunday (June 18th), they will not ordain any who are physically fit to serve with the colours. We could only wish that, as a body, they had done this earlier. The ordaining of men who are physically fit for military service, nearly two years after the outbreak of war, has made a very unpleasant impression on the public mind, which will not assist the work of the National Mission.

The Bishops of London, Carlisle, Chester, and Manchester, declined, we believe, some time ago to ordain men who were fit for military service, but the majority of the Episcopate have adopted a nibbling, and, as many will think, an unpatriotic policy.

There are not a few Churchmen who wish that the bench of bishops would now take the opportunity to tell the clergy that they are free to act according to their consciences in the matter of military service, and that they are ready to give their assistance and benediction to any who decide that they ought to enlist.

At present a certain number of the clergy, who have enlisted, feel, and with good reason, that they are under episcopal censure.

THE NATIONAL MISSION AND ITS GREATEST ENEMY.

The National Mission has been launched. The Nonconformist leaders have blessed it. The Bishop of London is touring the provinces. The rural deans are sending out circulars. The S.P.C.K. is printing large numbers of leaflets and pamphlets. Assuredly the Church has got the machinery for the Mission, but has she got the message for the nation? The next few months will answer that question.

As we think of the National Mission and hope that it will win many in the nation to Christian principles and practices, our minds travel back across nineteen centuries to that great National Mission conducted by John the Baptist and our Lord. No Christian doubts the powers of the Missioners on that occasion, yet it is notorious that the Mission was a failure; the nation, it was intended to save, refused the call and suffered the doom which its folly had invited.

What caused the failure of that Mission? It was the spirit of ecclesiasticism. That spirit both killed the Mission and crucified the Missioner. Ecclesiasticism dominated contemporary Judaism. The bitter chastisement of the Exile had expelled from the nation the spirit of idolatrous heathenism. Unfortunately under the shelter of Ezra's reforms that pre-exilic spirit crept back into its old dwelling place in a new form, and brought with it seven other spirits more wicked than itself, so that as our Lord declared the last state of the nation was worse than its first.* The old idolatry now took the form of ecclesiolatry; the nation substituted for the worship of its God the worship of its religious institutions.

What were those seven devils to which this spirit of ecclesiolatry joined itself?

* Matt. xii. 43f.

The first devil was the spirit of *hypocrisy*, both conscious and unconscious. We see it in the religious ostentation of the Pharisees; their long prayers in public places; their affected humility; their obtrusive self-denial; their assertive poverty. This devil combines scrupulosity with unscrupulousness. Its scrupulosity will not let it enter the judgment-hall of Pilate for fear of ceremonial defilement—there you see its principles. Its unscrupulousness does not make it shrink from deliberate misrepresentation to secure the death of an innocent but detested victim: there you see its methods. Not conscience but casuistry is its guide; quibbling consistency characterizes its arguments, but moral inconsistency marks its conduct. The plain man notes this, but the devil only replies by telling the plain man that he is an ignoramus aud accursed.

The second devil was the spirit of *formalism*, which attached the highest importance to appearances. It exalts minutiae of ritual and the details of Church order, but it treats deep and difficult moral and religious issues as non-existent. It tithes mint and rue and cummin, but troubles little in comparison about justice, loving-kindness and truth. Its conception of religion is mechanical and magical—the pre-prophetic and anti-prophetic religion of the lower culture—and it is strongly opposed to the moral and spiritual religion of the prophets.

The third devil was the spirit of *pride*. In our Lord's day it loved to be called "Rabbi" and "Father." It went in long robes and was inwardly gratified as it acknowledged the salutations of the populace. It sat in the chief seats in the synagogues and was accorded precedence at social functions. It understood the specious arts of self-advertisement, and was careful to see that its merits were duly acknowledged.

The fourth devil was the spirit of *fanaticism* and *intolerant partizanship*. It hated with a deadly hatred those whose religious principles differed from its own. It did not hesitate to defame their moral or intellectual qualities. It declared that John the Baptist was an irresponsible madman; that our

Lord was a glutton and a drunkard. Those who slighted its ceremonial ordinances it denounced as enemies of God, and regarded as even more hateful than the Gentile and the publican. Christ said of those who were its slaves that they compassed sea and land to make one proselyte, and when they had won him they made him twofold more the child of hell than they were themselves.

The fifth devil was the spirit of *particularism*. This drew a clear distinction between human beings, based on race or church membership. St. Peter's statement: "Of a truth I perceive that God is no respecter of persons; but in every nation he that feareth Him, and worketh righteousness is acceptable to Him," was anathema to the particularist devil, because the distinction between good and bad, moral and immoral, was not a primary distinction for it. It did not believe God really recognized such distinctions. What God recognized was whether you were a Jew or a Samaritan; whether you were circumcised or uncircumcised; whether you believed in "the tradition of the Fathers," or ignored it. *Extra ecclesiam nulla salus* was its motto. It did not even admit the possibility of "uncovenanted divine mercies" or the plea of "invincible ignorance" as affording convenient loopholes for escaping this general damnation.

The sixth devil was the spirit of *traditionalism* and *superstition*. Contemporary Judaism was intensely conservative. It was bound hand and foot by the past. It could never decide any moral and religious questions by an appeal to the living conscience and to present religious experience; it appealed instead to ancient precedents and authorities. Officially, it neither knew of, not believed in, religious progress. What was said "by them of old time" settled the question for all time. Thus it revered the past while it hated our Lord. It built with pious care the sepulchres of the prophets, and rigorously stoned their modern representatives.

The seventh devil was the spirit of *covetousness*. It overvalued money, and it sought by many devices to extract it.

Whether it made begging a fine art, and understood how Church debts may be made a lucrative source of Church income may be open to question—"They didn't know everything down in Judee"—but it was able to swallow up widow's houses, and to render the sacrificial system a means of personal enrichment. It was aware of the close connection between religion and finance, and our Lord's cleansing of the Temple was a source of grievance to it.

It was this sevenfold devil of ecclesiasticism which killed our Lord's Mission to His nation. It blinded the religious public. It frightened the civil authorities. Its powers of organization and intrigue enabled its policy to triumph. In consequence the nation was betrayed into rejecting the Saviour. This sevenfold devil of ecclesiasticism is the greatest enemy of the National Mission to-day. The form it takes to-day is somewhat different from what it took in Christ's time, but there is no difficulty in detecting its pernicious influence in our ritualistic and Kikuyu controversies, and in many another Church problem. It is most dangerous because most ingratiating and attractive. It comes to the Churchman in the form of a friend. It wears the garb of "a good Churchman" and "a strong Catholic," and it subtly substitutes love and loyalty to the Church for love and loyalty to Christ. When once that exchange has been effected, the Spirit of Christ—His love, His truth, His loyalty to His Father—are slowly but surely replaced by those sevenfold vices masquerading as virtues which crucified the Lord and thwarted His Mission.

May the National Mission begin its great task by publicly exorcising the spirit of ecclesiasticism, and by proclaiming that what it desires to do is to win the nation to Christ, not to the Church.

Christ's principles and Christ's spirit are what the nation needs. Whether it needs the Church will depend upon how far the Church enshrines the principles and spirit of Christ.

THE ETHICS OF CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTION·

By the Rev. Canon Rashdall, D.Litt., F.B.A.

To the student of moral philosophy the proceedings of the Tribunals under the Military Service Act are full of interest. It is often suggested that philosophy never influences practical life. And with regard to moral philosophy in particular it is frequently supposed that the subject is even more useless than other branches of philosophy, because there is a general and universal agreement as to what we ought to do, and, that being so, it can be of no importance to enquire into the theoretical grounds for our ethical creed. Recent experience shows how far this complacent assumption is from being justified. As the moral philosopher listens to the proceedings of the Tribunals, or reads of them in the papers, he can see in the answers of the "conscientious objectors" illustrations of almost every kind of bad ethical theory which he has encountered in the course of his reading. It will not be without interest perhaps to endeavour to enumerate the mistakes in ethical, or sometimes in political, philosophy to which these objections testify.

Before doing so, however, it may be well to say a word about a more fundamental question. People sometimes find it difficult to see how a recognition of the supreme authority of Conscience can be reconciled with the admission that not all consciences say the same thing, and that some conscientious persons make great mistakes. There is really no more difficulty about the matter than there is about the recognition that Reason in other departments is and must be our supreme guide, although the individual reason often makes mistakes. How do we know the multiplication table, or the axioms of geometry, or those laws of thought which are implied in ordinary reasoning? We simply see them to be true; they are self-evident. But truths

which are self-evident are not evident to everybody. There have been brilliant classical scholars who have been simply incapable of following the simplest mathematical reasoning. And still more often mistakes are made in the application of such self-evident truths. We make mistakes even in simple arithmetic; yet it never occurs to any sensible person to question the validity of mathematics on that account. Few people fail to recognise, when it has been adequately explained to them, the truth of the rules of the Syllogism; yet that does not prevent their speeches, or writings, or practical reasonings teeming with the fallacies which the logic books classify. Still more so with kinds of thinking which are less easily reduced to hard-and-fast rules than reasoning in syllogistic form. Just in the same way Conscience is the supreme guide in morals, and yet the individual conscience may, and does, make mistakes. It may be interesting to enumerate some of the ethical mistakes which are most frequently illustrated by the conscientious objections of which we hear so much at the present moment.

(1) In a few, and that the most respectable class of conscientious objectors, the mistake arises from exaggerated, or rather mistaken, reliance upon authority. The sayings of our Lord—isolated from the context, isolated from each other, understood with grim literalness—are taken as final guides in conduct without any appeal to the individual's own moral consciousness or any attempt to reach the fundamental ethical principles implied in them. Such a method must land us in absurdities. The most effective way of dealing with it is to bring out the inevitable inconsistencies which it is sure to involve at one point or other. The Quaker objects to the soldier, but usually supports, approves, and profits by the no less violent proceedings of the police. The Tolstoyan may be a little more consistent; but, in pushing his principle that the Christian must not resist evil to its logical consequences, he ends by disobeying the plainest teaching of the Master whom he professes to follow, refuses to bind up the wounds of the wounded man, and even leaves him to die, unless he has

CHURCH DIVINITY SCHOOL OF THE PACIFIC LIBRARY

received an assurance that he will not use his restored health to fight again. Such a man is as really and literally killing as the man who shoots a German to prevent his coming over here and killing others.

(2) Conscientious objectors of another type rely not so much upon the letter of Christ's teaching as upon what they take to be its spirit, or (without appealing to any religious principle) treat it as a self-evident moral axiom that we should not kill under any circumstances, no matter what are the consequences. Such an objector illustrates the mistaken and the disastrous social effects of the mode of thought known as Intuitionism—the ethical creed which holds that the deliverances of Conscience consist in isolated, hard and fast rules which must be obeyed under all circumstances without regard to consequences. Such Intuitionism is of course proof against direct refutation: sometimes, however, it may be dealt with, like the last, by pointing out its inconsistencies. One of the self-evident rules which most Institutionists will admit is the duty of universal Love or Benevolence: and this surely means that it is a duty to do what is best for society at large. The consequences of universal non-resistance may be pointed out, and the objector may be asked whether he thinks that he shows his love to humanity by reducing his country to the present position of Belgium or dooming whole unborn generations to the kind of life which has been lived for many centuries past by the Slavs under Austrian dominion or by the Christians of Asia Minor under the Turks.

(3) Then there are those who will readily admit the duty of promoting the general good, but who persuade themselves that this good is best promoted by non-resistance because they have a low and unworthy idea of what human good consists in. Working-men will, they flatter themselves, have as much food, drink, tobacco, and amusement under a German régime as they have at present, and what more does anyone want? It is easier to prove that they are wrong in this last supposition than to disprove their fundamental ethical proposition. There is no

direct way of dealing with those in whom the light that is in them is darkness.

(4) Lastly, there are those who will accept what appears to the present writer the fundamental ethical truth that conduct is right or wrong in so far as it does or does not promote for humanity at large a good which does not consist in mere pleasure, and whose ideal of good life may be unimpeachable, but who persuade themselves that such an ideal will not be promoted, under any circumstances, by fighting. Here the mistake turns upon ignorance of fact. The best remedy for such a state of mind is the study of history. One of the most powerful sermons which I ever listened to was a University Sermon by the late Canon Danks in which he enumerated (in reply to a recent pacificist utterance of Dr. Horton) some of the great crises in which the future of humanity had turned upon the result of a battle—the various victories which prevented civilized and progressive Christianity being crushed by Mohammedan barbarism, the victories which secured Protestantism and liberty of thought against the Catholic tyranny of France and Spain, the victories which prevented political liberty being crushed by Napoleon, etc.

(5) There remains a class of objectors whose mistake springs from bad political philosophy rather than from bad ethics in the narrower sense. Their "conscientious objection" amounts to a claim to do exactly what they personally think right, and to ignore the State. Their theory of the State, if indeed they are not avowedly and literally an-archists, would probably be the social contract theory. They think they are not bound by any authority to the setting up of which they have not personally consented. They are quite right in supposing that, if the State is founded upon consent, that consent must be unanimous, and must (as Rousseau contended) be frequently renewed. And they are justified in contending that, when they last voted for a parliamentary election (if indeed they are voters at all), they never gave their member authority to impose upon them the military service which they abhor. The present situation is a

striking illustration of the utter failure of the social contract theory to supply a basis for the kind of political obedience upon which the safety of the State and the whole future of humanity, at such crises as the present, depends. We are suffering at this moment from the effects of a century and a half of individualistic political philosophy, the teaching of which has penetrated deeply into thousands of minds who would not know what Individualism means, and who have never so much as heard of John Locke. Our people in future generations will have to be taught that the first condition of social well-being—and therefore the first duty of the good citizen—is a willingness to subordinate, not merely private interests, but private judgment, to the authority of the State. I do not of course deny that such a disposition may be carried too far: in Germany it does probably exist in excess. But in this country we have too little of it.

Before I conclude, I should like to say a word as to a confusion which seems to prevail in the minds not so much of conscientious objectors themselves, as of their champions. Some people think that the State has no right to make a man do anything which he has a conscientious objection to doing. They talk about the Military Service Act amounting to a revival of religious persecution and the like. They do not seem to see that religious toleration means merely the right to hold and express religious opinions, and to practice religious worship—not to *do* everything that any religion prescribes or approves. Even to the free expression of opinions limits are set by the imperative requirements of social well-being; many of the very people who use such language would often be among the first to advocate the suppression of immoral literature, though, undoubtedly, there are many who conscientiously believe in the views of life which such literature propagates. Still less can the State tolerate the open advocacy of sedition. As to the claim for toleration on the part of every one who acts upon the dictates of his own particular religion, no State could prosper or even exist which did not punish many kinds of

conduct which are quite in accordance with some consciences and some religions. If all practices approved by any religion are to be tolerated, we should have to tolerate child-murder on the part of the fanatics who think that by killing their children they will be sending them straight to heaven. We should have to permit human sacrifices, to allow people to throw themselves under the car of Juggernaut or to practise suttee. We should have to allow men to walk about the streets naked. We should have to make all taxation optional, since there are supporters of "free life" who regard all taxation as tyranny. There is hardly a vice, or a crime, or an absurdity which has not been practised in the name of religion—and quite sincerely. Not less inconsistent with the welfare of the State would be the permission to all and sundry to escape military service, combatant or non-combatant, because they have a "conscientious objection" to serve. They may of course refuse to serve if their conscientious objection is sincere and invincible: they may subjectively be right in doing so. But just the same principle of loyalty to conscience to which they appeal authorizes and compels us, in whom conscience speaks with a different voice, to compel them to serve, and, if they refuse, so to treat them as to prevent the disastrous consequences which would ensue if their example were followed by the much more numerous unconscientious objectors. The conscience of the majority tells them that such compulsion is necessary to the welfare of humanity, and therefore it is their duty to exercise such compulsion.

Ought we then to refuse to recognize conscientious objections at all? I do not think so. The principle of loyalty to Conscience is so important that it is desirable for a State, so far as it can safely do so, to offer those who have a conscientious objection to fighting some alternative form of national service. They are often men of high character, to whom the State should be as gentle as national safety will allow. Moreover, a man who is really prepared to be shot rather than to shoot will not be useful as a soldier. As to the objectors to non-com-

batant service, it is impossible to deny that they often have logic on their side: absurd premisses lead on to still more absurd conclusions. But the common-sense of the matter is that it is so easy to affect a conscientious objection which is really due to mere cowardice or laziness or selfishness that the State simply cannot discriminate between really conscientious and wholly or partially unconscientious objections, and must so deal with all objectors as to prevent their number multiplying. A man who finds it inconsistent with his conscience to dig a trench when the State holds that a trench should be digged is unfit for social life. He has declared war against society, and society must fight him. If for obvious practical reasons the State abstains from shooting him, it must at least do what it can to prevent the spread of such anti-social conduct.

Limits of space prevent my treating the subject with the fullness which its importance demands. I hope I have said enough to illustrate the fact that bad ethical and political teaching—at all levels of education from the University to the elementary school, and through all kinds of educational agencies from the philosophical treatise to the half-penny press—have very serious social and political consequences. It is one of the things we shall have to look to after the war. Has the pulpit done all that it might have done in this matter? How often have we heard (before the outbreak of the present war) sermons on our duty towards the State or on the question whether the morality of acts is or is not dependent on their consequences?

THE RELIGION OF SHAKESPEARE.

The tercentenary of the death of Shakespeare is being celebrated by Press and Pulpit. Such celebrations are all to the good. Last month Sir Sidney Lee, in an interview granted to a representative of the *Christian Commonwealth*, made a brief reference to Shakespeare's religion.

> "Sir Sidney said, with a smile, that he thought the poet was probably a conforming member of the Church of England. His will shows that. All his children were baptized. Some think that he was a Catholic—that is a very common idea. I do not agree with it. I do not think the dogmatic aspects of religion appealed to him at all. He had scant sympathy with the Puritans. But he had still less sympathy with people who pretended to be religious. A great many of his villains are sanctimonious hypocrites. On the other hand, his ideal hero, Henry the Fifth, had a very manly kind of religion. There are in the plays many Scripture phrases and expressions taken from the prayer book—even Falstaff uses them."

That is not surprising; it is Shakespeare himself who tells us: "The devil can cite Scripture for his purpose." The poet seems to have been no lover of the text-proof system of using Scripture, and suspects the theologians and casuists who adopt it.

> "In religion,
> What damnèd error but some sober brow
> Will bless it and approve it with a text."

It is of interest to observe that Shakespeare's Scriptural allusions, like Milton's, include the Apocrypha.

The supposition that Shakespeare was a Roman Catholic seems to have little to support it. Of all the great ecclesiastics who appear in his pages, it is of Cranmer, "the virtuous Cranmer," that he speaks most kindly. Our poet's ardent patriotism would have gone ill with the rôle of a Romish recusant in the spacious times of great Elizabeth.

Shakespeare's attitude towards the Christian religion seems to us to be essentially that of the thoughtful English layman. He feels the deepest reverence for our Lord :—

> ". . . Those blesséd feet,
> Which fourteen hundred years ago were nailed
> For our advantage on the bitter cross."

Religion is for him a matter not of theory but of practice.

> "If to do were as easy as to know what were good to do, chapels had been churches and poor men's cottages princes' palaces."

He has a sincere admiration for goodness, but it is goodness of an enterprising kind.

> "Virtue is bold, and goodness never fearful."

Yet he is no fanatic—

> "Virtue itself turns vice, being misapplied,"

nor yet an ascetic—

> "Dost thou think, because thou art virtuous, there shall be no more cakes and ale."

How he praises those Christian graces which rightly gained and rightly used make this life "life indeed"—contentment, patience, a good conscience, the power of silence, the uses of adversity, the resistance of temptation, the quality of mercy, chastity, temperance, loyalty, friendship, prayer and penitence.

It is of more than passing interest to observe how much he abhorred excessive drinking:—

> "Every inordinate cup is unblessed and the ingredient is a devil."

In this, as in so much else, he was far ahead of his age and nation. This appears particularly in his reference to drinking in *Hamlet*:—

> "Though I am native here,
> And to the manner born,—it is a custom
> More honour'd in the breach than the observance."

Conscience plays a large part in his dramas, especially its pangs:—

> "A peace above all earthly dignities
> A still and quiet conscience."

His attitude towards death is very like that which Bacon exhibits in his *Essays;* possibly it was characteristic of the Englishman of that age. Shakespeare does not fear death so much—he is inclined to think that the apprehension of death is the worst part of it—"cowards die many times," but he wonders what lies beyond it in that—

> "Undiscovered country from whose bourne
> No traveller returns."

It is a profound mystery—

> "Ay, but to die, and go we know not where."

He holds this world will pass, and "leave not a rack behind," but he does not dogmatize as to the future state of men.

"We are such stuff
As dreams are made on, and our little life
Is rounded with a sleep,"

is the verdict of Prospero, yet poor Hamlet soliloquizes:—

"For in that sleep of death what dreams may come,
When we have shuffled off this mortal coil,
Must give us pause."

Here he thinks and feels like the layman who does not find his faith strengthened by dogmatic sermons. In Stratford Church Shakespeare must have listened to many sermons which mapped out what lay beyond the tomb with an authority approaching that of omniscience—but he was not deeply impressed.

Only a lay pen we feel could have blended humour and sympathy in that inimitable account of the death of Falstaff. Your cleric of genius can do for you the passing of a Gerontius, but unless he were a Rabelais he could not, would not, describe the passing of Falstaff without a note of condemnation.

His attitude towards the clergy is very much that of the average educated layman. It is tolerant but not profoundly respectful. He marks with condemnation the pride and ambition of prelates. The parson, he is inclined to think, is rather better at preaching morality than at practising it.

"It is a good divine that follows his own instructions."

or, as he makes Ophelia say:—

"Do not, as some ungracious pastors do,
Shew me the steep and thorny way to heaven;
Whiles, like a puffed and reckless libertine
Himself the primrose path of dalliance treads
And recks not his own rede."

When asleep the clergy do not always dream of heaven, sometime they dream of benefices, but this is only when Queen Mab tickles their noses with a tithe-pig's tail. A very laic piece of humour. A passage in *As you like it*, suggests that, like most laymen, Shakespeare preferred short sermons, but had suffered from long ones:—

"O most gentle Jupiter! what tedious homily of love have you wearied your parishioners withal, and never cried '*Have patience, good people.*'"

On the whole his attitude towards the clergy is less sympathetic than that of Chaucer, but kinder than that of Milton.

Church rites appear to have been for him part of the social machinery rather than Divine institutions. He attaches, however, very high importance to the marriage rite, no doubt in the interests of morality—and as the outcome of his own unhappy experience,—yet he seems in true lay fashion to have little patience with Church rubrics when obedience to them clashes with the human feelings of kindness and compassion. The priest's refusal to sing a Requiem for Ophelia does not meet with his approval:—

Priest: "We should profane the service of the dead
To sing a *requiem*, and such rest to her
As to peace-departed souls.

Laertes: "Lay her i' the earth . . .
. . . I tell thee, churlish priest,
A ministering angel shall my sister be,
When thou liest howling."

Shakespeare's attitude towards life is essentially religious:—

"There's a divinity that shapes our ends,
Rough-hew them how we will."

Nevertheless he does believe in the value of human effort—

"Our remedies oft in ourselves do lie,
Which we ascribe to heaven."

He does not believe in human infallibility and omniscience—

"There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
Than are dreamt of in your philosophy."

Yet he is no obscurantist but believes in knowledge—

"Ignorance is the curse of God,
Knowledge the wing wherewith we fly to heaven."

He believes also in the duty of self-development—

"Self-love, my liege, is not so vile a sin
As self-neglecting."

His attitude towards the Universe is sane and cheerful. Three passages of singular beauty express briefly what any student of his plays can read at large in them all.

"There is some soul of goodness in things evil
Would men observingly distil it out."

"All places that the eye of heaven visits
Are to a wise man ports and happy havens."

"Find tongues in trees, books in the running brooks,
Sermons in stones, and good in everything."

THE OUTFIT OF A MODERN CHURCHMAN.

By the Rev. W. A. Cunningham Craig, M.A., Vicar of St. Sepulchre's, Holborn Viaduct, E.C.

V.—His Sacraments.

The place of the sacraments in Christianity and the meaning that is to be assigned to them are matters which depend on historical, on doctrinal, and on practical questions. The modern Churchman will rule out none of these from consideration when he is asked to say in what sense the sacraments are a part of his outfit. He cannot be content with a merely traditional answer, or with some long accepted definition, such as that put forward by the Church Catechism. Important as such things are, they do not exhaust the subject. And the answer that must be given to these larger questions is of very considerable importance; for when we come to think of it, the sacramental rites which belong to the Christian Church are older than the New Testament itself, older than the Church's liturgical forms, older than any of its creeds. It is true of course that what we may call the surroundings of the sacraments and the rules for their celebration have varied, but the essential points of the symbolism of Baptism and the Eucharist belong to the very earliest days of Christianity, and claim the direct authority of our Lord Himself. The method of their celebration and the value assigned to them have been different among different bodies of Christians and in different ages, but the striking fact remains that with hardly any exceptions all Christians at all times have preserved them, and have given them an important place in the common life of the Christian society. We are dealing with what is all but universal in Christian life and worship.

Now the estimate that we form of the sacraments depends upon a far larger question, namely, what is the attitude of Christianity to ceremonial rites and outward forms. Such a question can only be answered by a comparison of Christianity with other religions. I once heard it said by a dignitary of the Church that Christianity was the most sacramental of all

religions, and when I asked for an explanation I was told that what he meant was that the rites and ceremonies practised by other religions were not sacraments at all, in that they were not means of grace, while those of Christianity alone could rightly be described as sacraments. On such reasoning of course the statement was a self-evident proposition, but equally, of course, the explanation was one which really evaded the whole question. If you compare Christianity with other religions you will find that it is equally true to say that it is not the most, but in some ways, the least sacramental of all religions. Ceremonial rites and outward symbolic actions take a far smaller part in Christianity than they have done in most other religions. The religion of Israel was rich in its outward expression in ritual and sacrifice. The religions of the Greek and Roman world which gave way before the preaching of the Gospel, used a far more elaborate symbolism than the Christianity which took their place.

Compared with these, Christianity is extremely sparing in its use of ceremonial and symbol. Speaking generally, Christianity has preserved only two of such rites, and these of the very simplest character, a ceremony of initiation by the use of water poured or sprinkled and a common meal consisting of bread and wine. These are not only the simplest but they are the most universal of all religious customs. Christianity has made them its own in a peculiar sense. It has consecrated to its own use the most ancient and simple of all religious ordinances. It has allowed nothing else—except it be the ancient form of the laying-on of hands—to stand beside them. These represent not a maximum but a minimum of outward ceremonial form. To these, and to these alone, Christianity has assigned an unique position and value. The genius of Christianity has expressed itself quite unmistakeably in this way—in choosing only the fewest and the simplest forms as the outward tokens and badges of the Christian life.

To say this is not to depreciate in any way, but rather to enhance the value of the great sacraments of the Gospel. It is

their very simplicity which has been the ground of their world-wide appeal. It needs no elaborate explanation to bring home their meaning. They symbolise the great facts of the Christian religious experience, cleansing from sin, the new life in the Spirit, communion with God, fellowship with man. They carry their meaning upon the surface. We shall use the sacraments best if we keep them, as far as possible, in their primitive setting.

The modern Churchman will then in the first place recognise that the whole tendency of Christianity is to reduce outward ceremonial to its simplest and most elementary forms. He will value and preserve those rites for another reason. The unanimous testimony of the Church has regarded them as something much more than mere forms. It affirms that they are living and effectual means of grace. They have been the channels through which the souls of Christians have been in all ages sustained and nourished with strength and power from above. They have been to them the pledges of God's love to His children; the means through which they have entered into the closest communion with God in Christ; and have realised their common membership one with another. No Christian would wish to cut himself off from that stream of sacramental life into which has flowed the inexhaustible supplies of Divine grace, and so much of the purest devotion of the human heart. So the modern Churchman will value all that tends to preserve the essential character of the sacraments, and will be suspicious of anything that is likely to obscure it. He will recognise that that there have been two great dangers, closely allied to one another, which have often threatened to do this. One is the tendency to attribute to the sacraments anything like the character of a magic rite; the other is the tendency to invest their celebration with a sacerdotal character. Both these tendencies, magic and sacerdotalism, restrict the free operation of the grace of God, and make the appeal of the sacrament narrow and exclusive rather than representative and human. The Church has always held that the sacraments are means of grace, but along with this it has steadily contended that God is not

restricted to those or to any similar means, but that His grace knows no limits, and is restricted by no bounds. It is upon the background of that larger truth that the sacraments must be interpreted and understood.

Lastly, the modern Churchman will contend,—not only in dealing with the sacraments, but with any question of outward ordinance or religion,—that in its essence Christianity is a religion of the Spirit, not of the letter. That is its deepest, its most universal, its most far reaching message. That is the aspect which all the greatest teachers of Christianity have continually emphasized. That is the paramount truth which at all costs must be maintained,—which on no account or for no temporary advantage, must be forgotten. Now in a religion of the Spirit, no outward rite,—however sacred, however ancient, however primitive,—can have more than a provisional value. Its worth at the best, is relative, not absolute. A religion of the Spirit may make use of outward forms, but only as a means by which to rise to that communion of the soul with God which needs no outward means for its expression. That is the only thing which has an absolute, an abiding worth. Sacraments belong to an imperfect stage of Christian experience. If the soul were perfectly united to Christ by faith and love, then it would need no longer the bread and wine of the Eucharist to enter into full communion with Him.

If Christian people were in perfect charity one with another, then we should not require that common participation at the Table of the Lord to realise our brotherhood one with another. If we had sure possession of the substance, the type and shadow would pass away. There have always been in the Christian Church some elect souls, who have been able to pass beyond the need of forms, to dispense with sign or sacrament, and to see God face to face. They bear witness for our sakes to the larger truth. They lead the way to the distant goal. And it is on that goal that our eyes should ever be fixed, and to such an end that faith must never cease to strive.

THE INDECISION OF HAMLET.

By the Rev. JOHN GAMBLE, B.D., Vicar of St. Mary's, Leigh Woods.

The purpose of Shakespeare in *Hamlet* has been well described by Goethe. He writes in *Wilhelm Meister's Apprenticeship*:—

> "To me it is clear that Shakespeare meant, in the present case, to represent the effects of a great action laid upon a soul unfit for the performance of it. In this view the whole piece seems to me composed. . . . A lovely, pure, noble, and most moral nature, without the strength of nerve which forms a hero, sinks beneath a burden which it cannot bear, and must not cast away. All duties are holy for him; the present is too hard. Impossibilities have been required of him; not in themselves impossibilities, but such for him. He winds and turns and torments himself; he advances and recoils; is ever put in mind, ever puts himself in mind; at last does all but lose his purpose from his thoughts yet still without recovering his peace of mind."

Is the indecision so presented to us susceptible of further analysis? Irresolution may proceed from a great variety of causes. We may be irresolute simply through indolence. We may postpone the discharge of some admitted duty from sheer laziness, and the postponement may bring us no great uneasiness. We may almost forget the duty until something happens to remind us of it sharply, and to force us to set about it in earnest. Or, again, a man may be irresolute through ignorance or dulness, a failure on his part to realize the importance of the particular task in question or the danger of delay. Or his irresolution may spring from fear or timidity. He may wish to act, but fear of the consequences may arrest his hand and delay his trembling purpose.

Different from any of these was the irresolution of Hamlet. He did not put his task aside lazily and forget it. It was never absent from his mind. He did not fail to perceive its importance through ignorance or dulness, for he is by far the most quick-witted person in the poem. His speeches are alive with an insight as true as it is rapid. No other person in the drama approaches him in this respect. Nor is he afraid when a crisis actually comes and forces him to act with decision. Of irresolution then he shows no trace.

He is irresolute not because he thinks too little, but because he thinks too much, not because he does not see his situation in its entirety, but because he sees this situation fully, yet sees it placed against a vast and sombre background which reduces it to insignificance, and which has the effect of paralysing him.

He is one of those people who have, fixed in their minds and weighing upon them incessantly, what I may call the sense of nothingness. He feels himself to be living in a world which is wholly disordered and out of joint. The particular evil which he is called upon to remedy appears to him as if it were one little crack or flaw in a broken vase. The whole vase has been fractured, and one little imperfection the more does not make any great difference. The entire order of nature is wrong, and each separate evil in it appears so insignificant when compared with the sum total of evil, that it does not seem worth while to interfere with it.

This is the cause of Hamlet's irresolution. It is one form of the consciousness of infinity. He is of those who cannot keep from dwelling upon the infinite reaches of time and space in whose midst our brief life is placed, who look down into the bottomless gulfs which yawn between the stars, who keep thinking of the men and women who lived upon the earth 1000 years ago, or who will live on it 1000 years hence. They are overwhelmed, unmanned by these interminable vistas, so that their actual duty appears to be not worth doing or at least loses its urgency. "Nothing really matters," they say. "It will be all the same a hundred years hence."

> "Our days are but a span long and surely
> Every man living is but vanity."

Such is the indecision which the great dramatist here brings before us. It is not that Hamlet looks beneath the surface or endeavours to see things under the form of eternity. This we should all do. It is that he looks so incessantly beneath the surface that he misses what is on the surface. The duty laid upon him remains, from the very reach and amplitude of his thought, undone. His resolution is "sicklied o'er with the pale cast of thought." He tries to remind himself of the urgency

of his task by writing it down in his note-book. But we may make a memorandum in a note-book, and then forget the note-book and the memorandum. If we are really bent upon action, if the will has been really determined, we do not need note-books.

Yet Hamlet is fully equipped for any demand that may be made upon him. He has the "courtier's, soldier's, scholar's, eye, tongue, sword." He is under no delusions, and is imposed upon by no falsehoods. He is brave, resourceful, prompt, when promptitude has become quite imperative. Yet in spite of all he stands spell-bound. The task to which he has been called from the unseen world still waits for its accomplishment. The feeling which should move him to act spends itself in complaints that action of the sort necessary should be required from him. Why should it be he of all men who is called upon to restore order in this disjointed world? So he stands irresolute, reproaching himself for his inaction instead of ending it, and the joy of life is gone.

> "I have of late lost all my mirth; . . . . and indeed it goes so heavily with my disposition that this goodly frame, the earth, seems to me a sterile promontory; this most excellent canopy, the air, this brave o'erhanging firmament, this majestical roof, fretted with golden fire, why it appears no other thing to me than a foul and pestilent congregation of vapours."

His own indecision drapes the world in black, and turns its beauty into ugliness.

The object of the dramatist is, of course, simply to paint life as it is, or, as it is here expressed. He thus holds up a mirror to nature. He does not draw morals nor suggest remedies. He does not directly try to save men's souls, although the scenes he brings before us may be charged with religious messages. We must not consequently expect to find the indecision of Hamlet analysed in the drama or traced to its spiritual sources. This is left to the reader.

In the course of the drama, however, two groups of persons come before us, with whose earnestness of purpose Hamlet contrasts his own irresolution. They are what he should be but is not. They have stronger reasons than he has for being listless, or doing nothing. If he is lamed, crippled, by thought,

much more might they be. They, however, throw themselves whole-heartedly into their respective tasks while he postpones his and will not address himself to it in earnest.

The first of these groups is a company of players to whom the fictitious parts they act are so real, that they could not be more deeply moved if it were their own joys and sorrows that were agitating them. If they can do all this for nothing, what would they not do if they had his reasons for acting? So they shame his irresolution.

The other is a band of soldiers who are about to risk their lives for a piece of ground which they have never seen, and which would not be large enough to provide graves for the armies soon to be locked together in deadly conflict for its possession. Why do they expose themselves for a motive which seems so entirely insufficient, "go to gain a little patch of ground that hath in it no profit but the name?" All they know is that the task is laid upon them to do, and they do it, while he who has a father killed, a mother stained, lets all sleep, and sees the imminent death of twenty thousand men that for a fantasy and trick of fame go to their graves like beds. Such is the indecision of Hamlet, the source of a spiritual tragedy wherever it is to be found.

There are indeed two opposite tendencies which we should mark, both fraught with spiritual danger although not perhaps with equal danger.

We may magnify our office or our work until we lose all sense of proportion, and assume to ourselves an importance to which we have no claim. Work of any kind has of necessity a narrowing influence. To succeed we must give ourselves to it unreservedly. We must do the one thing to which we are summoned with all our might. We must shut ourselves up with our task whatever it be, concentrate ourselves exclusively upon it. This can hardly be done without a certain narrowing of interest, and loss of sympathy. Hence it is that successful people are often dull companions. Take them away from their particular work, and there appears to be nothing

else which interests them. It may be said of them with truth that they have fulfilled man's chief function, answered his paramount call. They have done what was required of them, done it well and thoroughly. They have not stood idle in the market-place, and allowed others to bear the burden and heat of the day. Still they have suffered loss. For man does not live by work alone. And it is possible that we may do our work successfully, and yet in doing it forget ourselves and our highest interests. The work may overwhelm, absorb, master us, so that we have no thought or care for anything beyond it.

The other danger is the one upon which the dramatist here fixes our attention. "The epithet *poor* may indeed," as a great Bishop* said, "be properly applied to great part or the whole of human life. Is it not a poor thing for a physician to have so little knowledge in the cure of diseases as even the most eminent have? to act upon conjecture and guess where the life of man is concerned?" Yes, we must reply, it is. But we must act upon the light we have. We cannot serve God acceptably by standing aloof from the work of the world as if it were too trivial or ephemeral to deserve the best thought and labour we are capable of bestowing upon it. And it is precisely those who see its smallness with greatest clearness, but who do not on this account relax their efforts, who dignify and ennoble human labour, and impart to it an eternal significance.

WHY DID THE LOLLARDS FAIL?

By Bernard L. Manning, B.A., Jesus College, Cambridge.

The surprising thing about the Lollards was their failure. It has never been satisfactorily explained, and some have doubted whether they failed at all. There appeared to be in the movement every element of success. It had as leader the greatest schoolman of his generation. It had political support of a substantial kind. Though the patronage of John of Gaunt and of Oldcastle might be a doubtful advantage, there was the

* Bishop Butler.

nucleus of a national party in those knights of the shire whose petitions against the Church were the most regular feature of Parliamentary history in the early fifteenth century. Above all, Lollardry had the New Testament in the vulgar tongue, a standard to rally the waverers, a spring to refresh the weak, a bond to unite the faithful even when they could no longer rely on the spoken word of the preacher. But the assault failed, and the ecclesiastical order which a century and a half later was to vanish at Henry's nod stood at least for the time impregnable.

Why did the reformers of the fourteenth century fail in their attack? Why did not dawn attend the "morning star?" It is because it helps to answer these questions that the *Dialogue of Dives and Pauper* is significant.

The Dialogue was composed between the years 1405 and 1409.* It was evidently intended for popular use, for it was written in English, and the author was always most careful to translate his quotations from Latin. He discussed questions of the market place, not of the schools. The point of view and the manner of treatment are, moreover, entirely unacademic. *Dives and Pauper* is a handbook to the people's religious difficulties. The author was, presumably, a friar, and at the end of the fourteenth century the mendicant orders were still closely associated with the common life of men. Their bitterest opponents did not charge them with a selfish and monastic isolation. It was Langland's complaint that the friars meddled in everybody's business; "as thick as motës in the sonnëbeam," they went everywhere and knew everything.

The value of the Dialogue is increased because it does not appear that the author's views were exceptional. His method and attitude might be original, but most of his conclusions were orthodox, even commonplace. It would be easy to compile a catalogue of similar results from contemporary writings. Archbishop Thoresby's popular *Instructions,* the *Lay Folk's Catechism*, offers a close parallel. It treats of the

* *Notes and Queries:* 11th series: 4th vol.: p. 32: Mr. H. G. Richardson's article.

Ten Commandments in words at times identical with Pauper's. The defence and explanation of the use of Images in the Dialogue was only an expansion of what had been said a generation earlier by Richard Rolle, the Yorkshire hermit. *Dives and Pauper* cannot be set aside as the production of one erratic mind; it is rather to be regarded as a particularly intelligent statement of the orthodox position.

It may be objected that it is unfair to accept an orthodox writer's account of fourteenth century heresies, because an apologist must misrepresent his opponents. This criticism would be forcible if it were relevant, but Pauper was not an apologist. His intention was not merely to convict heretics; he was anxious to appreciate the religious difficulties of his time, for by many of them he was himself still perplexed. The Dialogue was not so much the refutation of an opponent as the record of a man's communing with himself. "Dives" and "Pauper" were two voices in the same soul, and it was because he had faced the problems fairly for himself that the author hoped to help those who had erred or were deceived. His book is not the statement of one side of a controversy; it is a mirror of the religious unrest of the age.

Now if this view be in any degree correct, we may say without hesitation that the Church prevailed over its many foes in the fourteenth century because it deserved the victory. Its practices might be abused; its system might be corrupt; but its methods of thought were sounder, broader, and more capable of development than those which its adversaries offered as alternatives to the Catholic creed.

It is impossible to praise too highly the spirit in which Pauper, the defender of the established order, answers the questions of Dives. His frankness is admirable. He admits facts even when they may damage his cause. He never refuses to consider criticism merely because it is disturbing, and he does not appeal blindly to the authority of "Holy Church." He meets the heretics on their own ground, and, point by point, he shews that the orthodox position, rightly

understood, is stronger and higher than any other. He may quote liberally from the Bible, the Fathers, Aristotle, and the Canon Law, but his final appeal is to reason and commonsense. He condemns superstition, not so much because it is wicked as because it is foolish. It was considered lucky in the fourteenth century to meet frogs; they were said to bring a man wealth. To Pauper such a belief is the merest folly. The facts disprove it, for it is a matter of simple observation that "these labourers, delvers and dykers that moost mete with frogges & todes been fulle pore comonly." To the same empirical test he submits the unauthorised religious exercises, popular among the pious of his generation. Many Christians saw in the Black Death a visitation of God upon the wicked, and they had, therefore, begun to observe new fasts with the particular object of avoiding sudden death. This attempt to constrain God by laws of their own making seemed to Pauper impious; but it is characteristic of his method that he did not overwhelm the offenders with invective. He was content to observe calmly, "More sodeyn deth wyste I nevir that men hadde thanne I wyste theym have that have fastyd such fastes vii yere about."

At times his argument is startlingly modern. He defends public worship against the "privy praier" of the heretics by utilitarian and psychological considerations. The intoning of Divine service, attacked by Dives as "hackynge of the sillabes and wordes," Pauper considers valuable, because it tends to the "more excitatione of devocion of the people; also to putte away heavyness and unlustynesse." In the same spirit he pleads for fasting and the kneeling posture in prayer—not merely because they are ordered by the authority of the Church, but because they have been found usually to aid devotion. If at any time they should become too formal or a hindrance to worshippers, Pauper will be ready to abandon them.

When the argument turned upon an isolated text from Scripture, the superiority of Pauper's method was even more

obvious. The heretics had no difficulty in adducing words of our Lord and His Apostles which clearly were at variance with the practice of the medieval Church. Its elaborate liturgy stood condemned with the "vain repetitions" of the heathen; the sanction of war by the Church could not be reconciled with the unqualified command: "Thou shalt not kill;" there was no direct answer to the enquiry: "Sithen that god badde the vii daye shuld be halowed, why kepe we the viii daye?" and still more obscure was Divine authority for the observance of the festivals of the Saints. The divergence of medieval Christianity from the paths of the Early Church was not suddenly discovered by the Germans of the sixteenth century. It was realised and discussed a hundred years earlier, and in the Dialogue Pauper has justified it as well as it can ever be justified. Unconsciously he appealed to the principle of evolution: "Thanne holy churche was in his youthe and in his begynngne as saith Seynt Jerom," but "nowe holy churche is wexyd, & the feyth sprong and spredde and stabled in peas." This living organism, he maintains, should not be crushed back into its primitive state.

To some of these questions, raised in the fourteenth century, no final answer has yet been given, and it must be admitted that Pauper's interpretation of Scripture was sometimes fantastic and unconvincing. Yet his allegorical use of the Bible was preferable to the literalism of his opponents, who were prepared to apply the rules for the Day of Atonement* to every Christian Sunday. His results may not commend themselves to modern theologians, but his method was the less objectionable of the two. It was capable of adaptation and development as knowledge increased or circumstances changed. He made of the Bible not a dead book of inflexible (and contradictory), maxims, but a lively oracle of God to be interpreted by each age for itself according to its need and in its own tongue.

The Church, then, was victorious in the fourteenth century, because its intellectual position was sounder than that of its

* *Leviticus* xxiii. 26.

assailants. But there was a second reason for the victory: the Church had unity whilst the heretics had not. This obvious point has usually been missed, for it has been the custom to represent the religious history of the latter part of the fourteenth century as a struggle between two definite creeds: orthodoxy and Lollardry. *The Dialogue of Dives and Pauper* makes this view impossible. There was no anticipation of the sixteenth century duel between Rome and Geneva. Pauper was confronted not by a scientific and compact body of doctrine like that which faced the Council of Trent, but by a formless and incoherent mass of contradictory opinions similar only in their opposition to the existing religious order. Some of Pauper's opponents questioned the Divine guidance of the world; some believed in an irresistible fate, called by the astrologers "destinye." One doubted whether prayers were rational, since God answered so few, and His will was unchangeable; another condemned the doctrine of original sin as unjust. Fornication seemed to one party an innocent exercise of the rights of the individual, whilst some defended polygamy by the examples of the patriarchs. There was a wide-spread feeling against the lavish expenditure on Church buildings, and one sect had even ceased to use Christian burial. It was an age of questioning and doubt; but it is inaccurate to suppose that two religious parties were pressing complete and opposite solutions upon men. It was no question of accepting one of two creeds. There was set before the fourteenth century but one consistent answer: the answer of the Church. It was, therefore, not surprising that most men drifted back into the only haven which they could discover. England and Europe were not divided into opposing camps by Wycliffe, for he had not organised a rival Church. Lollardry may have anticipated some of the doctrines of Protestantism, but it represented only a small part of the religious unrest of the time, and it lacked the assurance, the definition and the dogmatism which enabled Calvinism to withstand the whole might of Rome.

Dives and Pauper was written in a land over which there still hovered the destroying angel. The Black Death is the background of the book. The fourteenth century closed with dire events, comets and strange stars, tempests and earthquake, disaster abroad, dissension at home, the Rising of the Peasants, and the murder of the King. But beyond all was the terrible memory of that "moreyne" which fell "by the ordenaunce of god for mannys synne or for to shewe his might and his worshippe." Men were conscious of their weakness; they felt helpless against the forces of Nature, of Destiny, of God—name Him how they would. Some were bold enough openly to "grutch agenst goddes domes," and "sey that god is unrightful and cruel;" but the predominant feeling was one of mere helplessness in the face of transcendent Deity.

From such a soil Augustinianism was sure to spring. Spontaneously the devout turned for guidance to St. Paul and the Bishop of Hippo. The doctrine of Election was their only refuge from despair, that chilling "wanhope" which was regarded by Langland as the gravest peril to religion in his day.

Now any doctrine of Predestination was disturbing to the Church of the fourteenth century, for it had set up an elaborate machinery for the salvation of humanity by good works. Pauper was, therefore, most emphatic about the freedom of the will, the responsibility of the individual, and the importance of daily life. God's plans, he declared, were not fixed, for at Nineveh "whan they repented hem & amendyd them & cryde after mercy he changed his dome & sparyd the cyte." Pauper had realised the seriousness of the revival of Augustinianism, and he spared no effort to convince Dives that every man's destiny was in his own hands. "God ruleth, demeth and governeth al makynde persone & communyte after that they deserve." Salvation is possible to all; it depends on a man's own effort, for "the feende is so feble & so faynt he may ouircome no man ne woman by temptation butt he wole be ouircome of him." No one must presume upon any fancied

election to eternal glory, for, as Solomon says, "No man wote sykerly whether he is worthy hate or love. And yit we hope, & owe alle to hope god wold love us and save us if we do our devour." "For only god knowythe for certayn thinges that been to come and he may change and lette the worchynge of kynde." It was by no accident that Pauper so persistently quoted from the Epistle of St. James.

The author of *Piers Plowman* had been confused in a similar way by the reviving Augustinian doctrine. He tells that:—

> "In a were gan I waxe and with my-self to dispute
> Whether I were chosen or not chosen."

But, like Pauper, he concluded that:—

> "Cryste cleped us alle come if we wolde
> Sarasenes and scirsmatikes and so he dyd the Jewes."

This was indeed no matter of abstract theology. It went to the heart of practical religion. If the new doctrine were to obtain any hold on Christian thought, the foundation of the medieval Church would be shaken. Masses and chantries, pardons and pilgrimages would cease to occupy a prominent place in the religious life; there would be an end of the whole penitential system with its nicely calculated balance of Confession, Penance, and Restitution. This was in fact the decisive issue.

And at this point the defenders of the Church were less successful than elsewhere. They could not conjure away St. Paul and St. Augustine. They could not refute the new interpretation of their writings. For a time the heretics might be repulsed. Disunion and a narrow view of the Bible weakened their attack; but in Augustinianism they had a formidable weapon that could not be wrested from their grasp. A century later the new learning and the Greek Text of the New Testament were to give them that intellectual strength which they had lacked in the earlier struggles. The union of Augustinianism and the new criticism of the Renaissance was too formidable for the Church, and what Wycliffe had attempted was effected by Calvin.

CHURCHMEN'S UNION NEWS.

The death of the Hon. W. H. Sherlock, of Caterham Valley, deprives the Churchmen's Union of the services of a keen and earnest lay member. He was much respected in his own locality, and was closely associated with the Church work of his parish. He helped in conjunction with the Rev. C. Moxon to found the East Surrey Branch of the Churchmen's Union several years ago.

Yorkshire Branch.—On April 7th a meeting of the Yorkshire Branch was held in the Philosophical Hall, Leeds. There was a good attendance, some sixty friends and members being present. Mr. Philip Bagenal presided, and a paper on "The Logos Doctrine and Modern Thought," was read by Canon Rashdall. The reader of the paper traced the history of the Logos Doctrine, beginning with the sources which St. John had drawn on for his interpretation of the Person of our Lord. Neither of the Greek Fathers, Justin Martyr and Clement of Alexandria, presented us with a systematic treatment of the doctrine. In Origen we first get anything approaching a system; yet although nothing could be more rational or modern than Origen's conception of the Incarnation, difficulties began when we turned to his conception of the relation between the Logos and the Personality of our Lord. Were they identical? Was the whole Logos incarnate in Him? As to Athanasius, his system was based upon exegesis of Scripture, rather than upon philosophical thinking. St. Augustine's treatment of the doctrine was most suggestive. He held fast to two great convictions as to the Divine nature, viz., its unity, and that its essence is love. Dr. Rashdall was in agreement with the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas in his exposition of the doctrine of the undivided Trinity, and in his definition of the term "Person" when used in this theological connection. He wished that doctrine were better known and more generally taught, for at present many so-called Trinitarians were really Tri-theists. He was afraid that the technical language of some of our formularies when used by the laity without a very full and careful explanation of its significance did much to encourage that most serious and objectionable heresy which divided the Divine Unity.

A vote of thanks to Canon Rashdall, moved by the Rev. H. D. A. Major, seconded by the Rev. T. Collins, was carried unanimously.

A vote of condolence with Mrs. Danks, on the death of Canon Danks, was also passed; sympathetic and appreciative speeches being made by Mr. W. B. Gordon and the Rev. W. C. Allan.

West London Branch.—The eighteenth meeting of the West London Branch was held at St. Marylebone Rectory, 38, Devonshire Place, W., by the kind invitation of the Rev. Dr. and Mrs. W. D. Morrison, on Tuesday, April 11th, at 8 p.m. Dr. Morrison presided, and there was a good attendance.

In a paper on "The National Mission," the Rev. W. Manning, Rector of Barnet, criticised the arrangements in connection with the Mission, his main points being that the council of seventy was not truly representative of the nation at large. A national mission of Repentance and Hope ought to be conducted by the co-operation of all Christian bodies within the nation, since it may be presumed that in so far as they are Christians, a Bishop and a Baptist repent and hope in the same way.

The speaker also questioned whether the repentance of the nation would be brought to "the test of works," such tests as the abolition of slums, the reduction of infant mortality, the stamping out of consumption and syphilis, the reduction of the evils of the turf, and the improvement in the wages of shop-girls. There were also many causes of misunderstanding which hindered the Church's influence over the nation, and led some to feel that we needed rather a Mission by the Nation to the Church, than by the Church to the Nation. A lively discussion followed, which elicited various expressions of opinion.

South Essex Branch.—The second meeting of the South Essex Branch of the Churchmen's Union was held on Saturday, April the 8th, at the Chaplaincy, Hornchurch, Essex. The Rev. Herbert Dale was in the chair, and the Rev. C. R. Shaw Stewart read a most interesting paper on "The Principles of Church Reform." It provoked an exceptionally well sustained discussion, almost to the point of making people miss their trains. Mr. A. W. Leyland was unanimously elected Hon. Secretary in place of the Rev. M. W. Manthorp, who had been acting pro. tem., but found himself unable to continue the duties permanently. After a very hearty vote of thanks to him, and also to Mr. and Mrs. Dale for their hospitality, and the appointment of July the 8th as the probable date of the next meeting, the proceedings were closed with the grace.

The Library.—The Librarian reports that the Churchmen's Union Lending Library is being used; some 33 books have been applied for. Those who have suitable books they are willing to lend, would be serving our cause by informing the Librarian.

THE ANNUAL SERVICE AND MEETINGS.

This preliminary notice is issued in order that members and friends may make a note of the date, **July 6th,** on which the annual London Meetings have been arranged to take place. At the Holy Communion in St. Sepulchre's Church, E.C., at 12 noon, the preacher will be the **Right Rev. the Lord Bishop of Southwark.** The names of the speakers at the public meeting at Sion College at 3 p.m. will be announced later.

REVIEWS.

A NEW COMMENTARY ON THE FIRST GOSPEL.*

This is a work displaying indefatigable industry, wide learning, great acumen combined with frankness and sincerity. Dr. McNeile, after enumerating the qualifications required by a commentator on the First Gospel, disclaims attempting to deal in close detail with the intricacies of the synoptic problem. Besides St. Mark and Q, he thinks the compiler of the First Gospel used material from other sources, *e.g.*, part of the Sermon on the Mount, and many sayings peculiar to his work, the Genealogy and the Birth narratives; some narratives about St. Peter and about Pilate; also a Greek writing, translated from an Aramaic original, containing passages from the Old Testament (*testimonia*), probably with brief explanations of their fulfilment in Christ's lifetime, drawn from a Hebrew text not identical with the Massoretic.

We turn with some curiosity to see how the examining chaplain to the Bishop of Oxford deals with the grave problems which are at the present hour threatening a disruption in the Church. First of all we come to the question of the Virgin birth. After careful relation of the suggested source for the story, Dr. McNeile concludes that "no non-Christian source, written or oral, has been found which satisfactorily accounts for the phenomena of the Gospel narrative. The written narrative was current within the lifetime of members of the family who were in a position to know the facts, and could have contradicted false statements. St. Paul's silence —if he was silent—on the subject, need not involve ignorance, as it certainly does not in the case of the fourth evangelist." Next we come to the story of the Magi, or astrologers. Dr. McNeile doubts the statement that Herod summoned the whole Sanhedrin, and feels that all the details of Herod's action raise difficulties. Then "it is not in itself impossible that Magians came to Jerusalem because of an astronomical phenomenon. That is perhaps an historical fact. But the impression of the chapter as a whole is that of a narrative which reflects the story both of Moses and of Israel, and was written in Jewish-Christian circles in which the use of 'midrashim' was common, and their purpose well understood. If this is the true explanation the wide difference between the narratives of Matthew and Luke do not call for harmonization."

Turning to the story of the Stilling of the Storm we find it thus ambiguously treated. "In Matthew the disciples' cry implores the unskilled passenger to do what the trained boatmen cannot, and yet astonishment is caused by the result; in Mark and Luke they awake Him not with words which show any expectation of a miracle, but because the boat is in danger. And the result is not so much astonishment as terror. The Lord 'rebuked'

* *The Gospel according to St. Matthew.* The Greek Text, with Introduction, Notes and Indices, by Alan Hugh McNeile, D.D., Fellow, Dean, and Theological Lecturer of Sidney Sussex College, Cambridge, and Examining Chaplain to the Lord Bishop of Oxford. Macmillan & Co., 12/6 net.

the winds and the lake, as though they were conscious beings possessed with demons. The incident is related, not primarily for the sake of recording a miracle, but as an instance of the subduing of the power of evil, which was one of the signs of the nearness of the kingdom."

On the Feeding of the 5,000 and the 4,000, as in the meal at Emmaus, and the Last Supper, Dr. McNeile thinks that the "conclusion can hardly be avoided that in all the meals the evangelists realised that there had been a Eucharistic act, and expressed it in their wording. None of the suggested explanations accounts for the enthusiasm implied in Matthew xiv., 22, and related in John. vi., 19 f. "Modern thought is learning not to reject miracles simply because they are miracles; their possibility must, in each several case, be judged in relation to the paradox of a transcendent God working immanently, and to the mystery of the Incarnation." With regard to the Walking of Jesus on the Water, Dr. McNiele objects to Dr. Abbot's translation of περιπατεῖν as "walking about," not "walking forward," that it is inconsistent with ἔρχεται πρὸς αὐτούς and the amazement of the disciples (v. 51). He thinks the evident purpose of Matthew and Mark is to relate something which indicated superhuman powers on the part of the Lord, powers ascribed to God (Job xxxviiii., 16), and to Wisdom (Sir. xxiv., 5)." Of St. Peter on the Water, the note runs: "To those who doubt its historicity it can be freely admitted that the facts related are of much less importance than their spiritual significance." On the stater in the fish's mouth, "The possibility must be recognised that some words uttered by Jesus were altered in the course of tradition." It cannot be denied that the miracle is different in character from others performed by the Lord.

On non-resistance, Dr. McNeile's comment runs as in the case of divorce, "Jesus teaches the principle without limitations by means of concrete instances, and if modern Christians took his words *ad literam* they would be doing precisely what He deprecates: they would be exalting the letter at the expense of the principle."

In dealing with the answer of Jesus to the Sadducees on the Resurrection, "God is not a God of the dead, but of the living," the comment runs "the possibility must be allowed that Jesus condescended to a rabbinic style of argument." We could wish that he had found the same style in Matthew v., 21-23, when the casuistical style is unlike that of Jesus, and the leap from the judgment of the Sanhedrin to the punishment of Gehenna as hell-fire, seems startling and irrational.

The eschatology of the Gospel teaches that "the great day was at hand, it would come within the lifetime of that generation, when God would reign over righteous men, and such alone, by His Agent, who would come from Him. But none knew when He would come."

Dr. McNeile is a little cryptic on the Agony in the garden of Gethsemane. In answer to the question how the words of Jesus were heard and reported, he says: "The Lord's words were not heard by the disciples, since they were asleep. His prayer was an agonized struggle, probably, for the most part, far beyond the possibility of articulate utterance, and lasting for a considerable time. But the records convey a living picture of what must have been His attitude of mind." The cry on the Cross, "My God, my God

why hast Thou abandoned me?" is regarded as "an expression of His agony of soul and body, but in that agony is involved the mystery of the Atonement." The earthquake described in chap. xxvii. 51, is regarded as analogous to legendary earthquakes connected with great events as at the death of Caesar, and the entrance of the Lord Buddha into Nirvana; the rising of the saints is also regarded as legendary.

For the reason why St. Luke omits the Galilean appearance after the Resurrection the conjecture is accepted, as the simplest, that he was not possessed of Mark's lost ending, but was dependent upon a source or sources, ultimately derived from residents in Jerusalem who related only appearances which took place in their midst.

On the Last Command, reported in chap. xviii. 19, Dr. McNeile says: "The section must probably be regarded as the expression by the evangelist of truths which the Church learnt as a result of the Resurrection, and on which it still rests its faith. It is impossible to maintain that everything which goes to constitute even the essence of Christianity must necessarily be traceable to explicit words of Jesus. The validity of the rite of baptism is far from being annulled if chap. xxviii. 19 was not an utterance of the risen Christ."

Whether we agree with Dr. McNeile's conclusions or not, we must discern in his invaluable work a sincere attempt to be loyal at once to the Catholic tradition and to truth. If we compare his notes with those of Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln, or of Dean Alford, we shall find the later commentator has made many important concessions to the critical spirit. Objections to the historicity of the narrative are fully and frankly stated. Answers to them are suggested with modesty and ability. In this way the book is a treasury from which may be drawn things new and old. A future edition may be enriched by reference to more recent conjectures. Meantime, we cannot too heartily express our gratitude to the author for a work so full of matter and so inspired with loving devotion to the truth.

J. Hunter Smith.

DR. FIGGIS AND MODERNISM.*

Dr. Figgis is a writer of marked individuality. He seems studiously to avoid the academic manner. Almost tremulously alive to modern thought, he is nothing if not up-to-date; his pages are full of allusions to H. G. Wells and Bernard Shaw, as well as to Nietzsche and Henri Bergson. He bids the clergy read modern novels.

> "Some of us are blamed, because in matters of profound import like theology or ethics, we seek light from literature, and instead of playing on the academic bowling-green, have ventured to interrogate the novelists, and playwrights, and poets. But these people are the prophets of the day. Besides our young men and young women are fed on these writings." (p. 115).

**The Fellowship of the Mystery.* The Bishop Paddock Lectures, delivered at the General Theological Seminary, 1913, by J. N. Figgis. Longmans, Green & Co. Price 5/-.

Things are certainly changed since the days when novel reading was held in "serious" circles to be a sinful waste of time. The reviewer was once told by an old gentleman that his father, when at school, was very fond of reading Dr. Johnson's *Rasselas*. He was once surprised by the Head-master in a corner of the play-ground buried in his favourite author. "My dear boy," said the pedagogue in agonised tones, "What will become of you if you waste your time in reading fiction?"

What then are the conclusions which Dr. Figgis draws from his study of modern life as reflected in our popular literature? He is as far as possible from the pleasing illusions which still prevail in official circles.

> "Assailed by clamorous infidelity, and equally clamorous fancy religions, living subsequent to the great vogue of naturalism, we are little likely to deny the fact of the 'Armageddon,' which is the present condition of the Church in the world. . . . The present writer was ordained deacon in 1894; at that time he was wont to say that unless he had information to the contrary, he never expected an educated lay-man whom he met casually to be a Christian in belief. . . . Even now there are many circles in which this view of the crisis would be deemed outrageous. If you take the atmosphere of a provincial cathedral close, or of most rural deaneries in country districts, it may be doubted whether its tone of complacent optimism would imagine there was any-thing worthy of serious thought in modern infidelity. Unbelief in such a view is a sort of freak, a fad—like wearing sandals—as far as practical work goes, a phenomenon so rare as to be negligible." (Appendix A. on J. H. Newman, p. 250).

Admitting then a serious gap between the modern mind and traditional Christianity, the question arises, On which side does the fault lie? It is hard to believe the fault is entirely with the modern mind. Our author evidently feels this; he cannot treat criticism with the airy defiance of Mr. Knox, whose *Loose Stones* he finds "brilliant but unsatisfying." He speaks in a way which every Liberal Churchman must echo of the continued witness of the Holy Spirit in the Church and the need for development.

> "It is not faith but a denial of faith, to suppose that all was fixed finally and for ever by the close of the fourth General Council or by the sixth century, or by the thirteenth, or by the sixteenth, or by any other. If we can commit blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, surely we shall be doing something very like it if we deny that He is speaking through God's Church in the twentieth century."

It seems a pity that holding such views as these, Dr. Figgis should have conceived so strong a prejudice against Liberal Churchmen. It is strange that one who can speak with appreciation of Tyrrell and the Roman Modernists, should fail as conspicuously as he does to do justice to those of his own communion. He repeatedly taunts them with indifference to the condition of the poor and to social evils. In a passage which has less than his usual urbanity he says:—

> "Knowledge of continental libraries; the occupation of pleasing academic and cathedral posts; an air of easy aloofness towards those who are bearing the burden and heat of the day (and are, by so doing,

incidentally preserving those very endowments); these things are not sufficient to establish a claim on those for whom religion is something more than an interesting topic of discourse."

So far as one can disentangle this rather laboured string of innuendoes this means that, in our author's opinion, Broad Churchmen are a set of self-indulgent dilletanti who monopolise all the best posts in the Universities and Cathedrals, and leave the hard work to others. When one remembers the life and labours of such a man as Canon Barnett, and of many other Liberal Churchmen, less famous but not less faithful, such language must appear exceedingly ungenerous. As for academical posts they are properly bestowed on men of learning, and nobody, one would have thought, could seriously maintain that the rewards of learning in this country are bestowed with too lavish a hand. In any case if they are in the possession of Broad Churchmen, it may be assumed that they have earned the right to hold them.

True in an appendix called "Modernism versus Modernity," Dr. Figgis acquits Modernists of the charge of dishonesty. We suppose that, having regard to Dr. Gore's pamphlet last year, we must be thankful for this concession. Such charges have always been brought against those whose opinions, or whose mode of expression, is unfamiliar. As we all know, they were repeated *ad nauseam* against the Tractarians. The Reviewer has been told by one who was present in the University Church, that Dean Burgon once delivered a sermon in which he controverted the arguments of an imaginary "Ritualist." Having demolished his opponent's position to his own complete satisfaction, the worthy Dean, who by this time was somewhat heated by his encounter with his visionary antagonist, thus addressed him:—"Get away with you, sir; I have done with you; you are a dishonest, equivocating hypocrite."

Obviously a charge of dishonesty does not really lie against anyone who (as Dr. Figgis says) "lays his cards on the table"; the really dishonest man is he who conceals his views under conventional verbiage.

He admits that:—

"All of us nowadays interpret symbolically certain phrases in the creed which our ancestors interpreted literally."

Speaking of references to Old Testament narratives in our Liturgy he says:—

"Many other statements occur in the formularies which relate to events professedly historical. Yet most of us, even those farthest removed from any standpoint rightly termed Modernist, can use the words relating to these (alleged) events only with mental reservation. What may be the ultimate judgment of history about the Deluge or the Passage of the Red Sea, or the Sinaitic revelation, I suppose no one can say. Probably no certain knowledge will ever be reached. But this much is certain. We do not consider it as essential to sincerity that a priest, when using the Baptismal Office should take the story of Noah in a literal sense; or that, when celebrating the Eucharist, he should hold as historical fact the traditional account of the giving of the law. In such matters latitude is claimed and allowed by all—except indeed

by the few survivors who still hold to verbal inspiration or at any rate to the historical accuracy of the early biblical narratives. But once this principle is allowed, it alters the whole way in which men look at the obligation of formularies. All that the liberals are doing is to claim to press this to its extreme conclusion."

One has always felt that the Traditionalists who have met all demands for a revision of the Prayer Book in a liberal direction with an absolute *non possumus* have been from their own point of view rather short-sighted. Obviously, if people become accustomed to use words in a non-natural sense, or as our author puts it, "with mental reservation," there is a risk that they may not all stop at the precise point which seems good to let us say Bishop Gore or Dr. Figgis.

The fact is we are all of us, all of us at any rate who read and think, a class by no means co-extensive with the clergy, the children of our age, that age is essentially a period of transition. At such a time there is a special need of the virtues of tolerance and Christian charity. Face to face with the great danger of materialism, practical as well as speculative, we should endeavour to close our ranks, and avoid needless recriminations. We should remember the wise words of Bishop Dupanloup, of Orleans, *Chrétiens ! aimez toujours, pardonnez toujours. Ne changeons pas en questions vitales les querelles de ménage.*"

G.M.

A PROTESTANT PROTEST.*

Sir Edward Clarke has collected into a handy volume a selection of his speeches, articles, and letters, put forth during the last fifteen years, dealing with the ritual controversy in the National Church. The point of view of his book is that of the Church Association. Let us say frankly that it is not ours. We are altogether with Sir Edward in his views as to the value of the Establishment, the need for the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in ecclesiastical causes, the importance of taking definite steps to check Roman teaching and practice within the Church of England. We desire with him to see his liturgical and doctrinal ideals preserved within the National Church. They have a legal right there which none others possess. But let us recognise the fact that there is a great body within the Church of England whose ideals are different. Will not sound statesmanship try to provide for both? Sir Edward will not consent to this. Although the Evangelicals are probably in a minority, yet he would sanction no departure from the at present legal, doctrinal, and liturgical standards. Now such a position is no longer tenable. His attitude is not really assisting to maintain the principles of the Reformation, nor is it offering any effective check to the Roman drift within the English Church. Moreover, it is becoming less effective every year. Modern Churchmen desire to see the rights of Evangelical Churchmen preserved. They desire that every Evangelical congregation shall have the type of service which it desires. They detest

* *The National Church—Catholic, Apostolic, Reformed, Protestant*, by Sir Edward Clarke, K.C. Longmans, 1/- net.

the unchristian and tyrannical attitude of a clergyman who establishes in an Evangelical parish a type of service which is hateful to the parishioners.

But on the other hand, the modern Churchman recognises not only the impossibility but also the injustice and unwisdom of trying to make parishes in which Anglo-Catholic ideals prevail conform to those which are Evangelical. There is a solution of the difficulty, but it demands both courage and tolerance, and though Sir Edward Clarke and Lord Halifax have enough of the former quality they lack the latter—of course, on principle. The solution of the difficulty which the modern Churchman offers is that of alternative liturgical uses combined with the establishment of parochial councils with legal powers giving the parishioners a constitutional control over parochial services and organizations. Will not Sir Edward Clarke join with modern Churchmen in providing a practical policy which would preserve for Evangelical congregations what they desire, and also provide for loyal Anglo-Catholic congregations what they desire, and at the same time check the Romeward drift by the establishment of definite and workable safeguards?

The Appendix of the volume contains a delightful paper on Maurice and Kingsley. Some of the verse quotations seem to need revision.

H.D.A.M.

CORRESPONDENCE.

IS THE BIBLE THEOCENTRIC?

SIR, *To the Editor of* THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

Will you pardon me as a layman intensely interested in the subject, for intervening in a discussion carried on by experts.

It is true, as you say, if space be not real our ideas of God either as transcendent or immanent may be alike inaccurate. But as we cannot help thinking in terms of space our mode of thinking will make a tremendous difference to our conclusions and probably to our outlook on life. The Rev. C. Poynder is quite correct in saying that the doctrine of immanence if consistently thought out would revolutionize our theology. For instance, it would abolish the theory of mediation upon which the priesthood is built up. Leaders there must always be, but they would be sought for among those who had most realised their sonship to the Eternal without separating themselves from their brethren, and the division between sacred and secular would disappear.

I find plenty of evidence in the Bible of the thought of immanence, but with this I will not trouble you; undoubtedly, however, the popular theology lies on the surface. What a wonderful interpretation, for instance, may be put on the saying in the Fourth Gospel, "If a man keep my word he shall never see death," when interpreted by the doctrine of immanence!

If I may be permitted to refer to a recent event, the Rev. R. J. Campbell's action in joining the Anglican Church seems to need explanation. With a modern Churchman's position I can wholly sympathise. Born into and grown up in the Church, he may consistently say: "I will remain in the

Church and try to reform her in accordance with modern thought, as she has been reformed before;" but for one who has had the larger vision, and the opportunity to take his stand upon it, to read himself into the Thirty-Nine Articles, which, however interpreted, postulate a supernatural Deity, an alien world, a human race born in wrath, and a sacrificial scheme of salvation, seems unaccountable except on the theory of a complete change of opinion. But the doctrine of immanence is built on a rock, and will stand though its opponents be many.

EDWARD CAPLETON.

28, *Red Lion Square, High Holborn, W.C.*

TRUTHFULNESS IN RELIGION.

To the Editor of THE MODERN CHURCHMAN.

SIR,

My letter on "The Most Vital Need," will fill a hiatus in the Rev. E. C. Dewick's excellent sermon. Though nearly all he says is very true, he omits to allude to the fact that Christ's truths are true for ever, and cannot be "developed" or improved upon. They are acceptable by every nation under the sun, because *Agapé* is a *natural trait* of the human constitution, and the most ignorant heathen awakes at once to a self-sacrifice done for him by a Christian. Stanley said that he did some little kindness to a native woman. She crept into his tent at night and handed him an egg, and crept out again. That was natural gratitude in return for Stanley's trifling act of *Agapé*.

This is the sole essence of Christianity according to Jesus Christ, who summed it up in "loving God and all others as oneself." So that St. James also describes "pure religion" (i. 27), as showing *Agapé* or self-respect to oneself, and *Agapé* by self-sacrifice for others.

Now, the difficulty I have experienced is that as a rule, the clergy are *indifferent*, or *flatly refuse* to listen to the truth. It is quite true that the clerical mind is not trained to reason *scientifically*, for the basis of all truths is *induction* on unquestionable *facts*, and *experimental verification*. This applies to Christian truths as to anything else. "Prove all things, and hold fast to that which is good," is *induction*; "He who willeth to *do* the teaching, shall know whether it be of God," and such is practical verification.

Instead of "proved truths" we hear much of "views." Such are mostly *a priori* deductions, and, scientifically, have only the value of *working hypothesis*, which must be tested to the full for verification.

But when Mr. Dewick says that "the priest deals with *truth expressed in fixed forms*," I would venture to observe that in so far as the forms are represented by doctrinal terms, they can oftentimes be *proved* to be *erroneous*.

Agapé on the other hand, *i.e.*, the spirit of an "enthusiasm of humanity" (Seely), is relegated to a somewhat subordinate position to Atonement, Redemption, Expiation, Transubstantiation, &c.

Let us endeavour to eliminate those misleading terms, and retranslate the original text into its proper meaning.

Will no clergymen come forward to help me?

GEORGE HENSLOW.

Bournemouth.